

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 10 2007

Appl. No. 10/042,967
Reply to Office Action of: March 29, 2007

is intended to avoid may be identified and searched for in the pre-written filters. Also a defined test may be used, such as running test communications through the router to determine whether the specific circumstances are addressed. Also criteria for determining whether the specific circumstances are addressed may be identified and the prewritten filters matched with the defined criteria.

Claims 26-36 also include identifying a substitute filter by a problem avoided, specific circumstances of network operation addressed, features of the existing filter, functions of the existing filter, or defined criteria.

3B. Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph – written description

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 are canceled, obviating this ground for rejection.

Applicants respectfully contend that new claims 19-36 are supported by the specification as originally filed and that no new matter has been added.

4. Claim Rejection under 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 are also rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hong (US Pub. App. 2004/0213233). Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 are canceled, obviating this ground for rejection.

Applicants respectfully contend that new claims 19, 26, and 31 are allowable because they include a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Hong or any other references cited in the Office Action, either individually or in combination, namely, Identifying one of the pre-written filters as a substitute for the specifically written filter. The Office Action suggests that (Fig. 9 ref. S905 “reconstructing routing table based on changed network topology information”, paragraph 33 “The algorithm in Fig. 3 computes